

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

(ml)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/080,034 02/21/2002		02/21/2002	William Peter Van Antwerp	G&C 130.28-US-U1 6773	
22462	7590	03/04/2004		EXAMINER	
GATES & HOWARD			CHISM, BILLY D		
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANG	LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			1654	
			DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/080,034	VAN ANTWERP ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	B. Dell Chism	1654
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF)	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal (
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	· ·	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second o	• *	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) 🔲 they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	 •
0. Other:		
		CHRISTOPHER H. VATE PRIMARY EXAMINER



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The comments presented by applicants fail to traverse the enablement rejection. One of ordinary skill in the art cannot be expected to know what would qualify as an insulin variant. One would have to pick and choose a "variant" and then subject it to the assay method for testing the stability of the claimed heterodimer. Neither the assay nor the disclosure gives method steps on how to predictably select complimentary first and second insulin species to yield adequate bioactive compounds. Choosing the variant is the undue experimentation. The unpredictability discussed in the previous office action occurs prior to any assay identifying complexes already formed.